Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	V 10/775,886	MATSUNAMI ET	Γ AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kaushikkumar Patel	2188	
All Participants:  Status of Application: <u>Applicant filed amendments in response to first office action.</u>			
(1) <u>Kaushikkumar Patel</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Shrinath Malur</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 27 December 2006	Time:		
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)		
Part I.		٠	
Rejection(s) discussed: Yes, Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragr	aph		
Claims discussed: 39			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.	·		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT N	WAS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.	·		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative not result in resolution of all issues. A brief su</li> </ul>	on. The examiner will provide a varate record of the substance of	written summary of the interview, since	he substance
·			
		¥	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During the interview, Examiner explained the reasons why the claims lacks enablement of independent claims. According to present application specification, pages 22-27, it is understood that the policies are applied per application basis but not by the application that created the file, hence the claims as written "application creating the file applies the policies" lacks the enablement..